

# THE COMMUNIST

## ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

VOL II, No. 7

JULY 1, 1920.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## The Counter-Revolution in Germany

By LOUIS FRAINA.

International Secretary, Communist Party of America

Berlin, March 28.

The Ebert-Noske-Bauer Government shorn of Noske and Bauer, is again in power. The streets are still a mass of barbed-wire entanglements erected by the counter-revolutionary troops against the Government troops, armed with rifles, sheath-bayonets and hand-grenades, patrol the streets prepared to shoot down the workers (scores have already been shot)—the identical troops that did not fire a shot in defense of the Kapp-Lüttwitz-Kapp. The old apathy is again dominant in the streets of Berlin—that cold, hopeless apathy which immediately impresses the observer in Germany. In the "high life" districts, in Unter den Linden and Friedrichstrasse, the swirl of frightful gaiety again rushes on, while in the proletarian districts there is sullen resignation, tempered by partial anticipations of a new struggle.

Five days ago it appeared as if this new struggle might start immediately. The proletariat of Berlin was still on strike. In spite of the Ebert Government and the trades union bureaucracy having issued orders to end the strike. In city after city the workers used the opportunity of the crisis to usurp power, developing the General Strike beyond the limits imposed upon it as a strike in defense of the Government. In Westphalia and the Rhineland, in the Ruhr mining districts, the working class, while not yet wholly clear on means and purposes, was in complete control, seizing government power and organizing an active Red Army of 30,000 men, with 5,000 in reserve. But, for reasons which will develop later, these hopes against the Red Army, which has been compelled to accept an armistice: disaster and massacre will come in the Ruhr.

These are the inescapable facts of the situation: the Ebert Government is in power, but the military coup d'etat has partially conquered since it has compelled the Government to compromise and move more to the Right; the Government is withdrawing its concessions, or rather its promises of concessions to the masses; the interests behind the military coup are conspiring as against the proletariat which rallied to the Government's defense; the Government is compelled to rely more than ever on military forces; while the Cabinet is being reconstructed according to the policy of the Right and not according to the demands of the Left. The proposal of the Independent Socialist Party for a "Socialist Government" (Cabinet coalition of Independents and Social Democrats) has been contemptuously rejected—a rejection accompanied by a new Terror; the Socialist-bourgeois Government, having chosen between the proletariat and the reaction, again chooses reaction.

The revolutionary crisis produced by the military coup, developing conditions for the final struggle for power, is being converted into a Cabinet-parliamentary crisis, with the Independent Socialist Party manipulating the situation to secure Cabinet concessions and parliamentary power; the Independents having, all through the crisis, acted not with an eye to the revolutionary seizure of power, but with an eye to (1) the reconstruction of the Cabinet on a "Socialist" basis, and (2) the coming elections to which the Independent Socialist majority party; while the Communist Party of Germany (as represented by the Reichs-Zentrale) is assisting the conversion of the revolutionary crisis into a parliamentary crisis by making up to the requirements of the situation and by rendering criminally opportunist encouragement to the Independents in their proposal for a "Socialist" Government.

And the masses? The masses are stirring uneasily, baffled and betrayed; and they may yet, under the pressure of events, initiate a new struggle, compelling the hesitants and the moderates to accept revolutionary action.

### I.—THE COLLAPSE OF DEMOCRACY

The Ebert-Bauer-Noske Government was directly responsible for the military coup d'etat. The coup was made by troops recently returned from the Baltic provinces, where the Government allowed a concentration of the most reactionary troops of the old German army for use against the Revolution and against the Russian Government, with the connivance of the Socialist Government, surreptitiously assisted Col. Avasoff-Bermondt in his counter-revolutionary campaign against Petrograd. The coup had been discussed for months and open preparations made; but the Government did nothing. On March 11 General von Lüttwitz met President Ebert in Conference and issued an ultimatum, but von Lüttwitz was not placed under arrest, while Noske, actively or compliantly, allowed the reactionary troops to prepare their coup. Late in the evening of March 12 Noske issued a statement that the fears of the Left concerning a military coup were unfounded. However, a few hours later 10,000 troops invaded Berlin to the strains of martial music and the plaudits of a crowd. The Government troops firing not a single shot in defense of the city, while the Government itself fled in an automobile.

There was no power of resistance in the Government—no resistance in democracy and the parliamentary regime. Aggressive and relentless against the proletarian revolution, the Government was weaker than a woman's tears against the counter-revolution. Democracy and the Government had been compelled to rely upon the most reactionary forces, upon the military of the old regime. Democracy and the Government did not act uncompromisingly against the military, since antagonizing or weakening the military meant weakening the basis of their own power; hence the Government had simply allowed the preparations for a coup to proceed. The revolutionary Government would have answered the threat of von Lüttwitz to march upon Berlin by mobilizing the armed proletariat and by general arrests of reactionary forces. Terror against the bourgeois-Junker re-

action; but the Socialist-bourgeois Government had disarmed the proletariat. While aggressive measures against the reaction would have meant an open break with the Right, and the collapse of the Government under pressure of Right and Left. At a meeting of the National Assembly on March 14, Socialist Chancellor Bauer said: "After mature deliberation the Government decided not to enter into a bloody struggle with the Kapp upstarts, and therefore determined to leave Berlin, thereby avoiding violence." (Against the Communists there never was any thought of avoiding violence.) But that is miserable equivocation. The Government had at its disposal in Berlin alone 30,000 troops and 50,000 armed civilians, and about 300,000 in all Germany; yet the Government evaded a struggle with 10,000 counter-revolutionary troops. Why? Because the Government knew that its troops, reliable in crushing a Communist uprising, were completely unreliable as a means of defense against a reactionary uprising. Moreover, an open military struggle would compel

tained the ascendancy of democracy. The petty bourgeois democracy, accordingly, adopted a policy of "watchful waiting" and "neutrality," which under the circumstances assisted the counter-revolution—democracy did not defend itself against revolution—democracy with whom there could be neither compromise nor merger. It might be unpleasant for the military reaction to conquer, but a satisfactory agreement could be arranged.

This, then, was the consequence of the Socialism of the Social-Democratic Party—that, in affirming democracy as the means to Socialism it developed means for the ascendancy of Junker-Capitalism, thereby directly promoting the coming of military counter-revolution.

And after 18 months of murdering the proletariat and Socialism, the Government and the Social-Democratic Party were compelled—to call on the proletariat and Socialism to act against its own creation, the military counter-revolution.

### 2.—DEVELOPMENTS OF THE CRISIS

In choosing the alternative of a General Strike the Government and the Social-Democratic Party were fully aware of the fact that the strike might develop beyond the limits imposed upon it as a strike in defense of democracy and the Government. But the Government was equally aware that it might depend upon the military in the event of the General Strike assuming revolutionary proportions; and, moreover, the Government simultaneously with the call for a General Strike—issued a name of Ebert, Bauer, Noske, Muller and David (Noske afterwards denied subscribing to the call)—prepared measures to prevent the General Strike becoming revolutionary. In the Ruhr district, for example, revolutionary and under a state of martial law, the strike was ostensibly limited, and it did not become a General Strike until March 17, when the struggle was no longer against the military coup but against the Socialist-bourgeois Government.

In accepting the alternative of a General Strike the Government, moreover, simply legitimized an accomplished fact, since the masses acted independently of the Government.

On Saturday March 13 the General Strike was proclaimed in Berlin by the trades unions, the Social-Democratic Party and the Independent Socialist Party. All three proclamations agreed on fundamentals—strike against the coup, in defense of democracy; the Independents suggested revolutionary phrases in characteristic style, but proposed no definite revolutionary measures; while the trades union spokes of the "local" Government being menaced by the coup, of the danger of reaction being restored in state and shops, of the Republic being in danger. There was no clear call to revolutionary action. The Communist Party which, on Saturday, declared against the General Strike on the assumption that the military coup and the Government were identical.

The response of the proletariat to the General Strike was immediate and complete; in Berlin, the struggle immediately and completely assumed the character of a proletarian struggle against the military-bourgeois reaction.

The situation in Berlin was most characteristic of the General situation in Germany. The collapse of the Government was complete; there was no trace of its authority or its resistance. Herr Kapp occupied the Chancellery, while General von Lüttwitz installed himself in the Ministry of War from whence Comrade Noske had issued orders of repression against the Communist proletarian Government district, now a fortress of barbed wire entanglements, machine guns and artillery, opens on the Tier-Garden where, fifteen months ago, Karl Liebknecht urged the proletariat to Revolution; while three streets beyond is the turgid canal into which the assassins of the Socialist Government cast the mutilated body of Rosa Luxemburg. The National Army either retired to its barracks or fraternized with the counter-revolutionary troops. The Noske Guards, insolently active in all the streets of Berlin, the day before, now scurried to cover, and did not appear again until the struggle against the revolutionary masses started. The Einwohnerwehr (literally, Guards of the Inhabitants, civilian White Guards) issued a declaration of neutrality (neutrality under the circumstances meaning assistance to the counter-revolution) while emphasizing its readiness to march against "plunderers," that is to say, against the proletariat; and it did march to action when the General Strike began to threaten law and order; and the struggle developed against the Government.

As against these open and masked forces of counter-revolution, the proletariat in the General Strike was alone. It was clearly, emphatically, the working class against all. The paralysis of industry, of most public utility, was complete; it was as if a giant mass of ice pressed down upon the city. The Kapp-Lüttwitz Government was isolated; its troops occupied the streets, but the proletariat closed its factories, halted its railway and street car traffic, and kept the city unlighted at night. The Kapp-Lüttwitz dictatorship issued innumerable proclamations about its readiness to answer the proletariat's demand for bread and liberty of labor—but there was no labor; the Kapp-Lüttwitz dictatorship issued threats against the profiteers, but this was no labor; the Kapp-Lüttwitz dictatorship issued a decree providing death for strikers and strike directors—but the General Strike implacably persisted. All semblance of authority, "legal" and "illegal," was now a myth of the General Strike.

The struggle of the proletariat in Berlin was, objectively, a revolutionary struggle. But, nu-

(Continued on page 7.)

## AGENDA FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

### I. Reports:

- C. E. C. and National Secretary.
- International Relations Committee.
- Editorial Committee.
- Defense Committee.

### II. Current Fundamental Problems.

- Present world situation.
- Present situation in the United States.
- Soviet Russia.
- Communist International and Party International Relations.
- Our attitude towards Parliamentarism.
- Mass Action.
- Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism.
- Our Attitude towards Economic, Educational and other Legal Workers' Organizations.
- Workers' Councils Before, During and After the Revolution.

### III. Revision of the Program and Manual.

### IV. Organization Problems.

- Communist Party Centralization
- Underground Organization and its forms.
- Communist Party units and C. P. Shop Committees.
- Functions of Language Federations in the Communist movement of America.
- Propaganda, Agitation and Other Forms of Communist Education.
- General Propaganda and Agitation.
- Classes for Propagandists and Other Communist Study Classes.
- Party Press and Literature.
- Literary.
- Technical.
- Communist Unity vs. "Centrist Unity."
- Defense and Relief Work.

### V. Revision of Constitution.

### VI. Resolutions.

### VII. Election of Party Officials.

the Government to arm the proletariat, thereby developing the forces of proletarian revolution. The Government accordingly chose to retreat and compromise; never for a moment did the Socialist Government of Ebert, Noske and Bauer forget the menace of a proletarian revolution; concessions to the Right rather than permit the revolutionary proletariat to conquer!

Democracy and the parliamentary regime, acclaimed as the final symbols of the Revolution crept? It was, in the persons of the Government, fleeing to Dresden in an automobile, and their issuing proclamations about law and order, right and the constitution—at a moment when the issue was power against power and might against might. The National Assembly, the National Assembly? It was dispersed as chaff before the wind by the bayonets of the Lüttwitz troops; the Reichstag, when the Assembly met, now as impossibly empty and three soldiers, while children played upon its steps. The National Assembly dispersed, issued its defiance to the military coup, spoke of democracy and right, of law and the constitution, decided to convene in Stuttgart—and exercised scarcely any influence upon the course of events. This hither of the workers on January 13, now, on March 12, was incapable of mustering either the moral or physical energy to resist counter-revolution.

The representatives of petty bourgeois democracy flinched before the military coup, where hostile democracy had no means of its. Moreover, for this democracy, the counter-revolution, against the counter-revolutionary troops meant piecemeal, a struggle within the military forces of the nation, to disrupt the power which main-



# THE COMMUNIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF  
THE COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED BY  
The Central Executive Committee

VOL. II JULY 1, 1920. No. 7

## "S O S"

Comrades: There are tens of thousands of "people" in America who are appealed to as "Comrades" by the betrayers of Socialism—the vile officialdom of the S. P. These cowardly counter-revolutionists need but to cry aloud for help, when they are in need, and the response is made in a ready chorus. Having forsaken the struggle, they are permitted by the forces of Law and order (who are not slow to recognize their aides!) to carry on in the open. Remaining a "legal" party, they meet in halls and in the streets; they print their "legal" papers, give their "benefits" with great popular success, correspond with their "comrades" without fear of post-office interference, and in every way are free to appeal for aid without governmental restrictions. They are safe, and it is possible for them to be so only because they have turned their backs upon every revolutionary principle and forsaken the class-struggle. The "stinking carcasses" of the S. P. that we forsook for the living body of Communism can call for help when it is in need, and get it—get it promptly!—in the thousands, yes, in the tens of thousands, of dollars.

The Communist Party, Comrades, has no such opportunity. Every channel is practically closed to us. The ordinary ways are shut, with a sign up: "NO THOROUGHFARE." Underground machinery, in the early stages of organization (facing, let us not forget, the rapidly ripening period of world conflict), is a slow and clumsy mechanism for meeting a financial crisis. Aside from our underground Party paper, the means for making an impassioned appeal to the membership are unimaginably meager. The task becomes incredibly difficult to bring home to the heart and mind of every member the realization of a crisis. We can only send an S O S over the wireless of our common revolutionary class-consciousness.

The time has come, Comrades, for such an appeal to be sent out broadcast for such "wireless" stations to pick up. Your Party wants you to pick up much that is not ordinarily heard—that cannot be set down. Your Communist understanding will help you to grasp the situation and the need. Respond as generously and as promptly as the need is great and immediate.

This must of necessity be no long-winded appeal. If we could hold mass meetings, you would be fired by the eloquence of your speakers. You would dig down into your jeans and throw your silver and your greenbacks into the contribution basket. There would be enough of you in the audience at one meeting to raise the money for the week's issue of the paper—or pay an old printer's bill so that the printer will continue printing our paper on faith (how few there are to print ours under present conditions you hardly realize) or meet the cost of technical work essential to the conduct of your Party.

But there are no meetings now. Our mail is watched, our activities, even the most innocent or most guarded, noted with suspicion of its character. Our press necessarily concentrated can carry no long detailed explanations of situations, and daily appeals for funds. We must leave much to your understanding, Comrades. All we can say is: **GIVE AND GIVE QUICKLY! AND GIVE TO THE LIMIT OF YOUR POWER!** The need is great—greater than we can tell. We suggest that you do a few "Saturday-ings" for the Party. For example of the Communists of Russia, who are "Saturday-ing" for the up-building of the Soviet work in Russia, by doing likewise for the up-building of the Communist work in America. For the month of July give your Saturday morning's wage, and send it promptly through the regular Party channels, that the work of your Party may be pressed on, unhampered.

You know in what financial crisis the criminal action of our former National Secretary left the C. P. Your Executive Committee is making herculean efforts to produce bricks without straw. How long we shall be able to continue to perform this miracle we don't know. If we could go to you in packed meetings, we would sound the note of warning in plain terms. This being impossible, your C. E. C. sends out an S O S. Comrades, we urge you, don't delay. There is danger in delay. Prompt and generous action alone will avert it. **ACT AT ONCE!**

### IN THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Vienna correspondent of the "Daily Herald" writes: At the conference of the Third International, held in Moscow on May 2nd, Bukharin, Tadev and Zinoviev were named as the Committee to decide the question of admittance to the Communist International.

## The Panic Is Coming

With the defeat last winter of the great Long-shornmen's coal and steel strike, a lull, like the calm before a storm, has come in the class struggle in this country. True, certain industries have struck intermittently—particularly in the garment and textile trades—and the "southern" rail strike continues in more or less intensity to cripple the rail carriers—but in general the situation is superficially less tense than last winter. The capitalist class breathes easier as far as the domestic situation is concerned, and is beginning to hope for a peaceful readjustment of the labor problems and a relatively peaceful reconstruction period in the future. Its main concern right now is with the international situation, which they fear may drag them into the whirlpool of new wars for which they are not prepared.

In this hope the capitalist class are doomed to deep disappointment and that before the year is over.

The black clouds of class war hang ominously over the horizon, awaiting only a psychologically favorable moment to break with the intensity of a deluge. The three great strikes of last year are bound to break out again, despite all the "Wilson Commissions" and the treachery of the labor leaders. The cost of living is pressing so hard upon all classes of labor, is increasing, according to the United States Labor statistics almost at the rate of three percent a month. The factories are working part time or shutting down altogether. This is true of nearly all industries, aggravating the already intolerable conditions of the vast majority of the workers.

The export trade is decreasing every month, because of the inability of the foreign nations to pay cash, or because their credit is exhausted.

The banks are coming in their long lines to the factories, and are holding on tight to their money, or investing it in U. S. guaranteed foreign securities at an exorbitant rate of interest. So much so, that the hope of a new boom in the stock market because of their relatively small interest rates has reached the stage of a national scandal in the capitalist world.

The wholesale price-cutting of large stores is another evidence of the instability and precariousness of industrial and commercial conditions. A financial panic followed by a stock market panic is due in this country and will break ere long.

In addition to the above—a new wave of strikes is impending which may hasten industrial chaos and put an end to the capitalist delusions of a "peaceful reconstruction period."

The anarchic coal miners who have been negotiating these weary months with no coming to a satisfactory arrangement, are clamping at the bit. How much longer the leaders can hold them in check remains to be seen. Likewise, the railroad brotherhoods—whose leaders have performed yeoman service for the capitalist class in checking and "outlawing" the strikes of the most dissatisfied and underpaid workers—will be urged to gather their forces for a tussle with the owners. There is a strong likelihood that the steel, coal and railworkers may come to some working agreement in a near future, but the pressure to bear upon the government to force wage-increases from the owners. This will naturally fall to the capitalists, who will absolutely turn down any demand for more than ten or fifteen percent wage increase. For a financial and industrial panic, complicated by a series of the most gigantic strikes in the history of strikes in this country—plus the new post-war psychology of the workers in general—possibilities and possibilities of tremendous significance from the Communist viewpoint. By this we do not mean that the social revolution is here—far from it. This situation will however hasten the capitalist disorganization of industry, demoralize the social and economic structure to an extent that will make recovery by the bourgeoisie even hasten the necessary objective conditions for a "revolutionary situation." That is all.

For the time being, as far as the working class is concerned, it will get a taste of the full weight of the capitalist state upon their heads. Court injunctions, impounding of union funds, martial law backed by the armed forces of the state, on a scale that will compel them to open their eyes and force them to adopt new methods of struggle—a new objective—a political objective—the overthrow of the capitalist state, the conquest of the state power and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

That is all we can hope for from the working class in the coming era of panics and strikes: 1) a growing class-consciousness which will lead to the ousting of their old leaders in the industrial world; and the adoption of more aggressive methods of warring the bourgeoisie with the employing class. 2) A new orientation towards the problems of the state as taught by the bitter experience of their own struggle.

That is all, but it is a great deal from our point of view. It will make possible for the time among the masses who until now have been stoically unresponsive. It will lead to the aid of Communist agitation in the shops and industries a new type of leader in the trade and industrial unions who, though they may not come into power will have a strong, influential, class-conscious minority behind them. It will lead to the making of the Communist movement a real "mass-movement" in that it will be possible for us to have—not a large membership, possibly the membership will naturally grow—but the possibility of getting the ear of the worker and the building Communist nucleus in the worker and the worker who will have the tact or open sympathy of the workers in the shops; something out of the question in the present.

With these new avenues open to the Communist party, and with the class struggle gaining impetus and speed in the direction of an open conflict with the capitalist state (due to the open conflict with the powerful antagonistic social and economic forces of inherent capitalist society and not to any contrived unconsciously forward by these forces) on our way to overthrow the capitalist state, the proletarian revolution—to the overthrow of the capitalist state and the establishment in this country of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

## A New Attack Upon

## The Communist Party

Dear Comrades,

New York City, June 10, 1920.

A few days ago the N. Y. Call carried a full-page headline: "PRINCE IMPLICATED AS U. S. WITH INDULGING HIS 'S O S' CHARGES FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE."

I hasten to inform you that THESE CHARGES ARE FALSE. The Call quotes extensively from a

statement issued by S. Nuorteva of the Russian Soviet Bureau, but it also states that Nuorteva scrupulously refrains from making any direct charges against Fraina.

In fact, however, he most unscrupulously raised old charges that have been investigated and found untrue.

Peterson's story was given a thorough hearing by the Bureau and C. E. C. members of the Communist Party, and on the basis of that hearing the Executive Council passed the following resolution:

Chicago, Ill., Dec. 17, 1919.

"The members of the Executive Council of the C. P. of A. have carefully examined the stenographic report of the hearing of the charges against Louis Fraina, Intern'l Sec. of the Party, which report is attested by six New York members of the C. P. C. and declare that the charges have no basis in fact."

The same specific dates mentioned by the former members of the Council can be traced from personal knowledge that Com. Fraina was in the City of Chicago until late at night on Sept. 7 and that on Nov. 17 and 18 he was in the City of Chicago on Party business.

The Council is unanimous that not the slightest taint of suspicion attaches itself to Com. Fraina as the result of this charge, and declares its faith in him as loyal and trusted comrade unshaken. All the circumstances in the case point to a plot against the Communist Party.

"The Council is in full agreement with Com. Fraina's continuance of his work as Intern'l Sec. and requests officially, as the representative of the C. P. of A., that he be received as its official representative."

The January meeting of the C. E. C. took the same stand, and issued a statement, which was published in The Call, against continuing rumors and innuendos especially circulated in and by the Socialist Party and its press.

The statement was given to be published in the stenographic report of the hearing, but we do not do that because the hearing brought out facts and relations very damaging to the Soviet Bureau; the purpose of which would have been to materialize to the D. of J. with which to attack the Soviet Bureau.

However, since the D. of J. apparently has, in some unexplained way obtained information about the hearing; and since Nuorteva has seen Fraina come out with his statements—confronting and misstating important facts and circumstances, thus attacking the integrity of the Party—we are free now to publish the proceedings in full, and we are going to do that just as soon as possible, thereby to disprove and destroy all charges, all rumors and suspicions.

Nuorteva is a clever and a very unscrupulous man; he writes a statement against Palmer and the D. of J.; he does not make any direct charges, but repeats the accusations of a spy and states and co-relates various "facts" which appear to support these accusations; "incidentally" he neglected how to a representative of the Communist Party and through him to the Party itself. The Call taking on the casual cheerfulness and quite "innocently" directing it also against the C. P. P.

In the order quoted by The Call the charges are as follows:

- 1) Peterson in spy of the D. of J. and a "friend" of Nuorteva, "had seen Fraina in the New York City of the D. of J. under circumstances indicating that he must be one of the agents of the Department."
- 2) "Certain information regarding communication with Moscow conveyed to Fraina which could not have been in the possession of anyone else outside of our office became known to agents of the D. of J."
- 3) Peterson reported "that he had seen in the files of the N. Y. office of Palmer's department a returned pay check indorsed by L. Fraina."
- 4) "That he was the man whom he had learned to know as an agent of the D. of J."
- 5) "While other members of Fraina's group were being arrested at that time nothing happened to Fraina himself."
- 6) "Fraina left (for Europe) in company with one Novositzky, a Russian doctor in the employ of a British steamship line and obviously a police agent."
- 7) "The letter (from Rozens to Marfens) could only have gotten into Mr. Palmer's hands through Mr. Fraina or Dr. Novositzky."
- 8) "Palmer is in possession of all reports from that conference (Amsterdam Conf.), which was supposed to be a secret one, and where no one from America was present except Fraina and Novositzky."

The main charges, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 are all based upon the word of a man who has PROVEN HIMSELF UNRELIABLE, CONTRADICTORY AND FALSE.

He was positive he had seen Fraina at the D. of J. in New York on the 7th of September, when Fraina was still in Chicago.

The second time he had seen him there between Oct. 1 and Oct. 15—he would not place the date at all.

The third time he was positive he had seen him there on Nov. 3, before noon—then he changed to Nov. 15, then changed back again to Nov. 3. But that he had seen a report made by Fraina on Nov. 13 or Nov. 15 Fraina was again in Chicago, and Nov. 3 he had not left from home before noon.

Peterson's description of Fraina's clothes sandy-black hair, etc., was all wrong. It could not be better since he admitted himself that he had not seen Fraina before those alleged meetings in the D. of J. All he had was a rather vague description by one of his chiefs.

When Peterson was brought in at the hearing where Fraina was present and was asked "Do you think that there is in this room anyone who can identify as Fraina?" he answered "No, I would not say so." Later he pointed Fraina out, saying that he recognized him by the voice. But where did he learn to recognize Fraina's voice when he had seen him only three times, and every time on his way out?

The checks issued by "Fraina" and the reports of Fraina nobody has seen "except" Peterson, and his imitation of the signature was an imitation of the real signature of Fraina. Peterson's story of trying to get the "documents" to send Fraina to Nuorteva, and that he was arrested and the papers taken from him before he could show them to anybody, sounds absolutely "fishy,"—not only in general, but in several important details as told by him.

The fact is that "after the testimony had been taken Com. Fraina asked everyone present to state whether he thought that the matter had been sufficiently cleared up so that he could leave for Moscow; all those present with the exception of the chairman and Com. Weinstein, answered with a negative opinion. Among those who said 'Yes' there was one member of the Bureau, Com. Nos. 2 and 7 Nuorteva has nothing more to say. It leaves out of the count any possibility, for example, the possibility that a "friend" of Nuorteva.

Charge No. 3 is really ridiculous on the face of

(Continued on page 3.)







By N. LENIN

Ramsey MacDonald with the amusing naivette of a parlor Socialist who merely juggles with words entirely lacking an understanding of their import, not even conscious that preaching a thing requires its being carried out in deeds, says: The Berne Conference made a "concession to the public opinion of non-Socialist elements."

politics are a joke. He knows perfectly well that we have built the Third International and unconditionally severed with the Second, because we were convinced of its hopelessness, as incompatible with its playing the bourgeois game as the proletarian game. He knows the bourgeois influence, bourgeois lie, and bourgeois corruption into the working class movement. If Ramsey MacDonald, desiring to discuss the 3rd International, walks around and around the question, uses empty phrases and doesn't say what is necessary to be said, it is his fault and his crime. For the proletarian needs the truth, and there is no truth in empty phrases. He is not dancing like a polished, respectable, mediocre lie.

their leaders has been raised.

Marx and Engels during forty years—from 1852 up to 1892—were constantly pointing out that the working class of England, due to economic peculiarities of that country (colonies, monopoly on the world's market, etc.), has been acquiring bourgeois character (or—has been becoming bourgeois in character). The century hatred of contemptible heroes of opportunistic and reformists, for the reason, that he branded many of the leaders of English traditions as men who had sold the bourgeoisie out of labor movement to its class—endured from within

"The bourgeoisie is much the worse for him, and Socialism is the same thing: Socialism in form, and Imperialism in deeds, the TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIALISM INTO IMPERIALISM. This phenomenon became now during the war 1914-18 and afterwards, the WORLD EVENT. Inability to understand this is the greatest blindness of the bourgeoisie. It is the blindness of the crime. Opportunism or reformism may have inevitably grown into SOCIALIST IMPERIALISM, but it is not the same thing. The bourgeoisie, in its calculations, robbing the workers of their wages, allows the bourgeoisie in those countries to bribe with its monopolistic surplus profit. Imperialism is the only way for the bourgeoisie to maintain the OF THE WORKING CLASS OF THESE COUNTRIES.

Those who fail to see the economic inevitability of this fact are absolute Ignoramuses or hypocrites, who deceive the workers by repeating the old commonplaces about capitalism and thereby hide the bitter truth of the desertion of a large faction in the Socialist movement on the side of the Imperialist bourgeoisie.

From this fact, however, two conclusions resolve themselves.

Conclusion number one: The Berne International is in fact, by its actual historical and political role, regardless of the good intentions and innocent wishes of some or another of its members, AN ORGANIZATION OF AGENTS OF INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALISM, working WITHIN the working class movement, spreading in it bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption.

in the countries with democratic-parliamentary culture of the standing, the bourgeoisie has learned how to act perfectly not only in all war-time conditions but also through deceit, bribery, flattery, in the English approved methods. The "hunchions" of the bourgeoisie in the field of politics are not only not becoming famous for nothing, and even in the same time he had already spoken of them reception of the socialist-traitor placed the war-time bourgeoisie in all working countries. Mr. Clemenceau, the corrupt reception of leaders of the "Third International" by the ministers of the Entente, and the "International", You shall teach them, and we will buy them—this is the English capitalist woman to Mr. Scrat-patriot who described in his reminiscences, how this lady, not only in the war-time, but even the Berne "International" put together the leaders of the "efforts" of socialist-intellectuals in

[illegible]

Marxist has written somewhere: you, "Dolshe-  
vich" are denouncing the Berne International, but  
your own firm, "Dolshevich," participates in it.  
This is the argument at hand, and I think you  
all know that Loriot fights for it, because every-  
national openly, honestly and heroically. And  
the workers of Zubatov's was arranging a meeting for  
with "police assistance" in order to fool them  
him attended these meetings in order to fool them  
Zubatov's influence the "Zubatovskiy" and "Right  
get the workers out of the 'clutches' " Babushkin  
when I knew that he was in the "clutches" Babushkin  
workers' propaganda circle when he was in my

\* Zubatov was the chief of the Czar's "okhran-  
ka," or, secret service police in Moscow. Editor.

the best and most devoted of workmen — "Iskrlats," leaders of the revolutionary proletariat. "Iskrlats," leaders of the revolutionary proletariat, and who was shot by Krenenkampf in Siberia in 1906, — was just as little a "Zubatov adherent" as Lenin is "Berne's adherent."

Conclusion number two: The Third, the Communist International has been organized just for the purpose of not allowing the "Socialists" to get away with the ill-service recognition of the reactionary examples of which Ramsay MacDonald gives in his article. The ill-service recognition of the revolution, in reality covering up the reaction, opportunistic, reformist, and anastatic and petty bourgeois pcn, was the direct progeny of the Second International, against which we are waging the Third International, against which we are waging the death.

When the Second International died, saying shameful bankruptcy,—it must be understood properly. It means the bankruptcy and death of opportunism, reformism and petty-bourgeois Socialism. Because the Second International has this historical value, has accomplished good work which a conscious worker must not deny, namely: formation of mass workers' organizations, trade, and political organizations of workers, utilization of bourgeois parliamentarism as well as all institutions of bourgeois democracy in general, etc.

bourgeois democracy, the defense of opportunism, which brought the Second International to a shameful death, in order to help the approaching revolution, which even Ramsay MacDonald is compelled to recognize, is the only way to conduct all the propaganda and agitation from the point of view of the revolution, in contra-distinction to reformism, systematically explaining to the masses this contra-distinction as the first step of the parliamentary, union and other kind of work. Not by any means to reject (excepting special cases of course), utilization of parliamentarism and all the other methods of reform, but to consider them only as a by-product of the revolutionary, proletarian class struggle. Not a single party of the Berne International satisfies this condition. The only step towards a correct understanding of how the propaganda and agitation must be conducted by explaining the difference between reform and revolution, how necessary it is to the both the party and the masses for the revolution.

evolution. It is not necessary to combine legal (open) and illegal (underground) work. The Bolsheviks had taught this especially and insistently during the war of 1914-1918, while the heroes of contemptible opportunism scoffed at the very idea. (Indeed, the praise of the "democratic freedom" of the Western European countries, republics, etc., Now, only plain swindlers, bent upon deceiving the workers, can deny that the Bolsheviks were proven right.) The "democratic freedom" of the advanced and most "free" of the bourgeois republics, where the rule of the bourgeois terror does not reign, where freedom for agitation for the workers' revolution is not forbidden, is a criminalization in this direction has not been forbidden. A PARTY, WHICH BY THIS TIME DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THAT, UNDER THE REIGN OF THE BOURGEOIS AND BOURGEOIS PARLIAMENTS, IS A PARTY OF ORATORS AND SCOUNDRELS—A PARTY WHICH, IN THE LIEBOWITZ OF THE REVOLUTION OF THE REVOLUTION IS FOOLING THE MASSES, THE PLACE FOR SUCH PARTIES IS IN THE YELLOW BELT OF THE INTERNATIONAL." IN THE YELLOW BELT OF THE INTERNATIONAL THEY CANNOT BE. (Italics ours.)

Third, a persistent and merciless war must be waged for the absolute expulsion from the warring class movement of those opportunist leaders, who showed themselves before the war, and especially after the war, to be incapable of politics as well as of action. The "trade-unions" must be purged especially in the "trade-unions" which have been the theory of "neutrality" is a hypocritical and contemptible subterfuge which helped the bourgeoisie to gain a hold upon the masses in 1914-1915. The "trade-unions" must be purged of their leaders, while in deeds do not carry on persistent work for the influence of the revolutionary—and only for the revolutionary party, in all and every mass working class organizations—are parties of traitors.

**Fourth**,—it is impossible to reconcile their condemnation of imperialism in words, while at the same time to wage revolutionary war for the liberation of colonies (and dependent nations) from their oppressors. This is sheer hypocrisy. This is the public recognition of the fact that the working class movement, such a party, English, French, Dutch, Belgian, etc., while in words it condemns imperialism, in deeds does not wage the revolutionary struggle against it, but for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, which does not help systematically the revolutionary work in the colonies. This has begun everywhere, which does not import into the international literature for the use of the revolutionary parties the past of scoundrels and traitors.

**Fifth**,—the great hypocrisy of the phenomenon of the parties of the Berne "International" in words to recognize the revolution, and to their recognition of the revolution, every phrases about the revolution, but in deeds to display the reformist attitude toward such beginnings, which are the birth of the revolutionary manifestations, which are the birth of the masses, breaking bourgeois laws, stepping over bourgeois laws of legality, such as for instance, the laws of the bourgeoisie, the laws of the bourgeoisie meetings among the troops, soldiers' protests in military caserns and camps, etc.

Any hero of the Berne "International," asked whether his party is carrying on such systematic work, will reply either with evasive phrases, screening an absence of such work; lack of organization and machinery for it and inability of his party to carry it on, or, with a declamation against "freelating anarchists," etc. But just this constitutes the treason of the Berne "International" to the working class,—its actual desertion into the camp of the bourgeoisie.

All the sound-leaders of the Berne "International" have of their lips declarations of their "sympathy" toward revolution in general, and

\* Gentlemen of the Socialist Party of America,  
the Socialist Labor Party (and all other advocates  
of "legality," as, for instance Y. F. and his  
friends), please accept the compliments of the  
Editor.

toward the Russian revolution in particular. But only hypocrites and fools cannot understand, that the exceedingly rapid successes of the Revolution in the first years of its existence, in many directions, of the building up systematically for the leadership of demonstrations and apparatus for the work among the troops, of the study and creation of their experience, summing up the results of their experiences, the necessity of revolution, training and preparing leaders of the masses for the occasion.

"The deepest and the most fundamental differences which summarize all of the above, and explain the inevitability of an irreconcilable theoretical and practical political struggle of the revolutionary proletariat with the Berne "International," are the questions of the conversion of imperialist war into civil war and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The infection of the Berne "International" with bourgeois ideology is best exposed in having failed to understand (or not wishing to understand, or war of 1914-16, it did not realize the inevitability of its conversion into a civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of all the advanced countries.

1914 pointed out this inevitability, the Philistines among the countries retorted with stupid ridicule, and Berne "International." At present the conception of the imperialist war into a civil war has become so obvious that a number of countries, not only in Russia, but also in France, in Hungary, in Germany, even in neutral Sweden, while the imminence of civil war is being noticeably felt in all the advanced countries without exception.

Now, to pass over this question in silence (as does Ramsey MacDonald) is to dispose of the question of inevitable civil war by using the question of inevitable civil war to dispose of the question of inevitable civil war. This is a class, is equivalent to direct treason to the working side of the bourgeoisie, is actually going over to the leaders of the bourgeoisie, is the real political proof of the inevitability of civil war, is the understanding that the bourgeoisie has of its own strength, is the bourgeoisie's position in anticipation of just such an event.

Employment in all events, forces at their command exacting gigantic energy, mind and determination, not shrinking before the most bestial determinations, the whole countries to hunger, disease and starvation, the bourgeoisie of all the world is preparing to suppress the people in the impend- ing civil war. But the heroes of the day are the mediocres like fools, or hypocritical preachers, or worn-out, reformist strikers, who have no signifi- cant abhorrence or more repulsive. There is no sight so revolting as the bourgeois press, which, with the reds would continue searing the capitalists in civil war, in order to frighten the bourgeoisie with them, in order to win their consent to concessions from the workers.

To this end only resolve themselves in the writing of the philosophy and politics of the Bern "International."

This pitiful and contemptible method of these  
revels we already had occasion to observe in  
1917-1918 in the part of the liberals (Casta-  
ro) the "social-revolution" of the Mensheviks  
and masses in the realization of As to educating  
to shape our policies in strict conformity with  
ons from this point of view, clarify and solve all ques-  
ences of the Berne "International" bringing slavish  
one once for all and our only purpose must be  
primitists, i. e., nine-tenths of the incorrigible re-  
"International," into the fifth garbage pile  
the bourgeoisie, such underlings who still  
enjoy the confidence of such portions of the working  
dors, who about the possibility of the beautiful  
rums, blind to the interests of the party, who  
vert the masses from their trashy stories,  
the charming possibilities of the revolution by portray-

All the writings of Kautsky as well as our Men-  
evik and Social-revolutionists present substan-  
tially this sort of portrayal, the whimpering of  
a cowardly philistine who is afraid of

have no possibility to repeat here in detail fundamental economic causes make this reaction, and only revolutionary path inevitable, and under any different solution of the problems placed by history on the order of the day written and voted through civil war. It must be stated, Messrs. Katsky will be written on this Berné "International" but not other leaders of the "International" but not understand this is not only, and we need only add, the

to distant from the only add that understand this for the ignorant but the truth than prejudice. supporters of the working masses and sincere workmen and ally now, after the war, the inevitability of the revolution, of civil war and the dictatorship of the proletariat than such gentlemen as Kautsky, MacDonalds, Vanderveides, Brantings, Turan- and others, gluttoned with the most learned re- nismis misconceptions.

nerally-observed phenomenon in the most kindred revolutionary consciousness of the awakening masses are novels of Henry Barbusse—"Under Fire," "Dreadnaughts." The former has already been translated into all languages with a circulation of 230,000 copies in France alone, and the conversion of the ignorant and average man into a mass, completely brought down by the weight of false ideas and prejudices into a revolutionist, by his reaction during the war, is portrayed in an unusually forceful, honest and truthful manner.

the masses of the German nation. The proletarians and the semi-proletarians stand with us and are joining us, by the thousands, to the ranks of the masses. The bourgeoisie is left without arms and is doomed to crumble like a house of cards. The movement it will be thoroughly conscious of the masses.

During the war by Karl Liebknecht was made use of the press for the Entente countries and the masses—to make the sole purpose of deceiving the masses and the English imperialism appear as man, as they used to say, to this "only honest

the heroes of the Berner "International" sitting in the same organization with the Liebenicht and Rosa Luxemburg, who were workers, who played the role of hanger-on of bourgeoisie, rendered hangman's services to "condemn" the Scheideggians (as if "condemnation" can help to change the situation) actually, the same organization with these

late Harry Quelch was expelled by the German Government from Stuttgart in 1907, because he denounced a meeting of European diplomats as "a gathering of thieves." The leaders of Berne "International" are not only a gather-



## By K. HORNER

**Editorial** (translated from German)

The article printed below represents only one chapter of the pamphlet dealing with the question of mass action. It is merely as well as other tactical problems confronting Communist parties and the revolutionary army in various countries. Therefore, this article is necessarily not so much touching upon certain aspects of the problem superficially, in a very general way, without entering into details,—not touching upon certain questions at all,—but rather, in the pamphlet from which this article is reprinted, has been published in Germany, in response to a certain particular situation on certain questions, created in the course of a revolutionary working class movement in that particular country. However, by necessity, been narrowed in its scope and in its application (and even in its political illustration) to specific needs and requirements of that country.

Consequently, this article, in order to justify its title, needs a great deal of elaboration and additional explanation.

However, leaving this and a more elaborate treatment of the problem in question, to future articles on Mass Action and allied problems which it is our intion to publish in The Communist, we shall limit this editorial note to a few remarks absolutely essential and indispensable, in our opinion.

below, should be noted that the article reprinted in its entirety, does not tackle the question of Mass Action in its entirety, does not analyze the different forms of Mass Action, such as for instance, mass demonstrations, mass strikes, mass armed insurrection, etc., and the conditions for their success. The article takes only one aspect of mass action, namely, its directness, or direct character,—as distinguished from the indirect character of parliamentary action,—and analyzes the conditions for its success or any other action where the mass action acts directly, but through the medium of some intermediary agencies, such as parliamentary and trade union representatives, and "leaders." Thus, the scope of the article may be formulated as: direct vs. indirect action.

(2) Even this, more limited problem is not treated exhaustively, being mainly confined to parallels taken from the history of the German working class. It does not consider the attitude of the old Social-Democratic "leaders" and the present Communist attitude.

There are two kinds of leaders—the former (represented by Scheidemann, Kautsky, Mac Donnell, etc.) who, as if to avoid the danger of supplanting the masses without any attempt to win an idea to call upon the masses for action to rely upon their organized support, without taking account into their confidence whatsoever, and quite often not always for the benefit of the masses. These are "leaders" who want the army—the masses—to perform only one "action," namely, to elect them into office, and then to disband the army, and leave their army to fight, and expect to accomplish everything through their wisdom and "diplomatic" manipulations.

The latter—the true leaders, are those who act together with the masses; who prepare them for the struggle and, when the moment comes—they lead the masses in their assault upon the bourgeoisie. These leaders are represented by Lenin, Trotsky, etc. They often hear cries raised against "leaders" and "leadership" and they are right. But these "leaders" they cannot be trusted, etc. etc. In this connection we should remember the old proverb: "Don't throw the child out with the bath water." In throwing out the child together with the dirty water, we throw out the good along with the bad. We throw out the good from the working class movement, such "leaders" as Lenin, Trotsky, and Kautsky, we should not also throw out such "leaders" as the bourgeoisie. Trotsky, whose role and importance in the revolutionary proletarian movement cannot be overestimated.

The antagonism between Communism and Social-Democracy had already become evident before the war, although not under this name. At that time it related to tactics. Under the name of "Left Radicals" ("Linkerradikale") an opposition manifested itself in the ranks of the Social-Democracy (out of which originated the older adherents of the present-day Communists), who, in spite of the opposition of the radicals and revisionists proved the necessity of mass action. In the 1920's, the radical opposition, such as Kautsky, was forced to reveal the anti-revolutionary character of their views and tactics.

The parliamentary and trade-union struggle under the rule of the young and vigorous capitalism had slightly ameliorated the conditions of the working class, and, at the same time, had erected a bulwark against the ever-lasting tendency of the bourgeoisie to impoverish the masses. In the last decade, this bulwark, despite the powerful organization, broke down. Imperialism strengthened the power of parliamentarism and militarism, weakened the power of parliamentarism, forced the unions to take a defensive position, and prepared the world war. It became clear that the old weapons of original class struggle had become obsolete. The masses of all countries had to be engaged in activities, often against the will of the trade leaders, now in tremendous trade-union conflicts, in order to break up the monopolized industrial life, or else, in demonstrations of a political nature very often the eruption of the proletarian revolt and the show of its power to the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie was forced to grant concessions. Ofttimes, too, these outbreaks were throttled by massacres. The Social Democratic leaders seek to use these movements for their own ends, and to avert the danger. They acknowledge the usefulness of political strikes for definite purposes to be tolerated only on the condition that they be waged within practical limits, and that they be organized at the command of the leaders. And, above all, tactical questions to be subordinated to the instructions of the leaders. In this manner, mass strikes are kept within limits. But of no avail. The policy of compromise introduced by the leaders usually paralyzes the powerful force of the masses. The masses are forced to be subordinate to this policy of compromise. Moreover, the menace of danger which inspires the reigning bourgeoisie, the feeling of ultimate defeat, the feeling of the approaching storm, can take on and grow into a revolutionary movement—was absent from both of the "disciplined" mass actions. The harmlessness had been pro-

The revolutionary Marxists, the present Communists, saw even then the narrowness of the bourgeois view of the role of the Social-Democrats. They knew that throughout all history the masses, even the classes, were the driving and active power in all revolutions; that revolutions never came about through the reasoned and wise counsels and procedure of the acknowledged leaders. When conditions became unendurable, the masses, for any cause whatsoever, would erupt, and the leaders would be called into power as a new class or stratum, capable of erecting a new society to suit their needs. Only during

the last half century of comparatively peaceful development could be the illusion he created that their superior wisdom, directed who could, through Peoples'. The members of Parliament, the Continents of the Executive Committee believe that their deeds speech transactions and resolutions determine the course of events and understanding behind them are or occasionally make appearance when they are called for the purpose of emphasizing the words of their spokesmen, only a prelude to disappearing from the political horizon. The mass of people a passive role merely, it has to elect leaders

no longer act as the effective force of revolution.  
The Revolution has no real value in regard  
to former revolutions. Even though it  
is less valuable than the great difference  
of less value when the great difference  
between proletarian revolutions is taken into  
consideration. The proletarian revolutions are the mass  
workers and the petty bourgeois revolutions are the mass  
workers but once as in Paris in February  
1848. Only the Revolution, for the purpose of the French  
old empire or a new untenable power like the  
then the Republic. When they had performed their task,  
they have appeared as new individuals, as a  
Government, in order to reconstruct and renew  
the old order, the laws, the laws.  
The proletarian mass power was needed to  
throw the old order but not to build up the  
organisation of a new system of society was  
the organisation of a new system of society was

According to this model the radical Social-Democrats also conceived the proletarian revolution, which they—contrary to the reformers—considered as a social revolution. In their opinion, a tremendous uprising of the people would overthrow the bourgeoisie, abolish military domination, and put the Social-Democrats into power, and the Social-Democrats would then create a new society, in which the new laws would create the Socialist order. But they did they conceive the proletarian revolution. These Social-Democrats did not understand the meaning of the proletarian revolution is the liberation of the masses from all class domination and exploitation. They did not understand that the masses take the reins of destiny into their own hands. They did not understand that the masses are not narrow-minded slaves who only think of their own interests and cannot see further than their own workshop, nor are they a herd of sheep who are led by the conflict of independent spirit, filled with the strength of solidarity, no longer confused by the intrigues of the bourgeoisie, but are capable of independently adjusting themselves to conditions. This change cannot come about through the gradual accumulation of small successes, victories and repeated defeats, gradually gain power, the firm unity, and the ripe understanding of the masses, but through the process of the struggle in the proletarian revolution.

The duration of this process will differ according to the conditions and will depend mainly upon the power of the resistance put forth by the dominant class. The reason that the process was terminated with comparative speed in Russia was due to the fact that the combination of the landed aristocracy and the peasants on the side of the working class. The great institution of power of the bourgeoisie is the state, which is a centralized, unbranched organization of domination with all the means for exerting power at its command—legislation, the schools, the police, the courts, the army and the bureaucracy that has all the direct, effective means of all the channels of public life in its hands.

Revolution is the combat of the proletariat against this machinery of oppression, of the ruling class, and it can only attain their liberation by confronting this hostile organization by a more formidable and powerful organization. The State is the organization of the bourgeoisie against the workers powerless, divided and intimidated in order to crush the slightest strivings toward freedom. The force of the State is the force of the bourgeoisie in all directions, in opposition to the power the working class applies mass action, which paralyzes the state machinery and causes its collapse. The State is the organization of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. In fact, the proletariat cannot be victorious, for over and over again will it see the State rise against it. The conflict then—the world is not going to grow better, better, but it will be much sadder, and that finally, the repeated mighty actions of the proletariat crushes the bureaucratic state machinery and it breaks down power.

Carl Kautsky took exception to the interpretation of the proletarian revolution even before the war. He maintained that the proletariat should not be misled by the tactics which would lead it to the seizure of power. He argued that it would have to use its state machinery for proletarian in order to enact the laws in its own purposes. As he pointed out, the state would also be controlled under the rule of the interests of the workers. The aim of the proletariat must be to seize and not to destroy the state. He also pointed out that the connection as to how the state machinery of the victorious proletariat would be created—whether it would be a continuation of the bourgeois state or a new state with new state-constructed machinery. But the Social-Democratic theories as they were formulated and propagated in the early 1900s, and the theories of the economics of capitalism out of which Socialism would "necessarily" originate. They never dealt with the "how" and for that reason the question of how the proletarian revolution could not be answered. It was only later explained. The difference between the Communist and Social-Democratic interpretations had now been made to become quite evident.

For the Social-Democrats, the sole aim is the uprising of the people, which overthrows the old power and places the Social-Democrats in government. The Social-Democrats are the state-organ of the proletarian revolution. The overthrow of the Hohenzollerns in Germany on November 7, 1918, was for them a real proletarian revolution, which, they believe, has opened the way for the new regime had been disorganised by warfare, made the victory attainable without difficulty. For the Communists this revolt could only be the first step towards the final victory, which would come through the abolition of the old oppression opened the way for the working class, so that they could, through the creation of their own class organisation, under the leadership of the Social-Democrats allowed and even aided in the building up of the old state power upon a firmer basis, after a period of hard struggle. For Kautsky and his friends Germany is a true Social-Democratic republic—Noske and his Imperial Guard (Reichswehr) are simply the chief of duty of the working class and the working class aid in governing even if they do not rule. Most certain-

But they could not expect Bolshevism and far Social Revolution—according to Lenin and again that the proletarian revolution would not be a long time before all of a sudden it would be ripe for an industrial revolution. The proletarian revolution is a means that although the proletarian himself is not the exploiters, he should allow himself to be exploited, and then, when the exploiters have been reduced to a few millionaires, the large industry would be nationalized. Or, in plain English, the exploiters would be nationalized at the head of the government. The old exploiters—Democrats, but capitalism with its exploitation of the proletariat, would be the basis of the Social-Democratic conception after making the proletarian revolutionary uprising. There must follow the nationalization of the Revolution as a longer process of socialization. Communism takes the opposite view-point, maintaining that the proletarian revolution is a means to the nationalization of power and industry—a long process of nationalization, during which time the proletariat becomes the exploiters and the bourgeoisie is reduced to a few millionaires. At the end of this long process the old state machinery is destroyed. At the turning point of this struggle, when the power has been nationalized, the proletarian must do a short work made of exploitation, the abolition of all claims to unearned revenue will be proclaimed, and the nationalization of the power will be constructed a new machinery—industrial machinery, an organized, systematic mechanism of production.

## (Continued from page 4)

ing of thieves—they are a gathering of dastardly murderers.

They cannot evade the tribunal of the revolutionary workers.

6.  
Ramsay MacDonald gets away from the question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat with a few words, as from the subject for a discussion about freedom and democracy.

No. It is high time to act. Discussions are too

The most dangerous—coming from the Bernese "International"—is the lip-service recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Italics ours, Ed.) These men are apt to recognize anything to sign anything, in order to remain at the head of the working class movement. Kautsky already says that he is not opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. French social-patriots and "Centrists" also sign under the resolution for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

They do not deserve any confidence whatsoever. Not lip-service recognition is necessary, but the actual rupture with the policies of reformism with the prejudices of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois democracy, the actual carrying on of the policies of the revolutionary class struggle.

They attempt to recognize the Dictatorship of

the Proletariat in words, in order secretly to read into it the "will of the majority," "general suffrage" (Kautsky precisely is doing this thing bourgeois parliamentarism, the refusal for the complete destruction of the bourgeois state machinery. We should guard ourselves against these new tricks, against these new lackeys of reform far more than anything else.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat would be impossible if the majority of the population did not consist of proletarians and semi-proletarians. Kautsky & Co. attempt to falsify this truth by preventing the necessity of the "Vote of the Majority." In order to accept the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. \* (Italics ours. Ed.)

Comical pedants. They did not understand that generally not through the ballot, but through civil war are all the serious problems of politics decided at that time, when the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has been placed on the order of the day by history.

They did not understand that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is the power of one class taking into its hands the whole apparatus, the whole machinery of the new state, conquering the bourgeoisie and neutralizing the whole petty-bourgeoisie, abolishing and intelligencing it.

The Kautskys and MacDonalds give lip-service to the recognition of the class-struggle, in order, in reality to forget about it in the next decisive moment in the history of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat in the moment when the proletariat, having captured the state power, and supported by the semi-proletariat and with the assistance of this power, the class struggle, they intend eventually to the abolition of classes.

Like true philistines, the leaders of the Bernad "International" are repeating the bourgeois-democratic phrases about liberty, equality and democracy, not noticing, that they are repeating the obsolete-merchant ideas of "free and equal, a.d. failing to understand that the proletariat needs the state not for "freedom," but for the suppression of his enemy, the exploiter and the capitalist. (Italics ours. Ed.)

The liberty and the equality of the merchant died, as died capitalism. Neither the Kautskys nor MacDonalds will be able to resurrect it.

The proletarian needs the abolition of classes—this is the real meaning of proletarian democracy, proletarian freedom (freedom from the capitalist and from the capitalist system) proletarian equality (not the equality of classes—a commonplace into which the Kautskys and MacDonalds fall, but the equality of workers, who are not capital and the capitalists).

are overthrowing capitalism, the freedom and equality of the bourgeoisie is the bourgeoisie's deception. The proletariat takes the power, becomes the ruling class, destroys bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, suppresses the bourgeoisie, suppresses all attempts of the bourgeoisie to return back to power, gives real freedom and equality to the "oppressed" masses (which can be realized only with the abolition of private ownership of the means of production) gives them not simply "rights," but the real use of what has been taken from the bourgeoisie.

The one who does not understand this meaning of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (or—what amounts to the same thing—of Soviet Power or Proletarian Democracy), — accepts this word in

I cannot develop here in more detail these ideas, expounded by me in the "State and Revolution" and in the brochure "Proletarian Democracy and the Renegade Kautsky." I may conclude by dedicating these notes to the delegates to the Luggerne Congress of August 10, 1913, of the Berne "International."

July 14, 1913.

• We call especial attention of our comrades to a remarkably deep thought contained in this paragraph. How many in our own ranks of the former "Left Wingers" thought along with Kautsky & Co. assumed the same false position.... The whole position of the so-called "michtigrantes" and their followers, for instance, is based on this misconception. Editor.

• A Russian word, signifying "intellectuals" and professional people as a separate social group.



# Greetings To Communists Abroad

By N. LENIN.

(Continued from last issue.)

The followers of Scheidemann and of Kautzky are still talking of "democracy" in general; they still cling to the ideas of 1848. They talk of "bourgeois democracy," but their deeds are those of Louis Blanc. They talk of "majority" rule in the belief that equality at the ballot box represents equality as between exploiters and exploited, the worker and the capitalist, the poor and the rich, the hungry and the well fed.

The Scheidemanns and the Kautzkys behave as if the honest, noble, peace-loving capitalists had never made use of the forces of wealth, money, capital, bureaucracy, military dictatorship but had always in truth applied the capitalist rule to the decision of public affairs.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkys (partly from hypocrisy and partly from extreme dishonesty and direct propaganda of reformist activity) are bolstering up bourgeois democracy, bourgeois parliamentarism and the bourgeois republic, and are endeavoring to make the workers believe that the capitalists are conducting State business according to the will of the majority, and not according to the will of the capitalists, and by means of deceit and oppression of the poor by the rich.

The Scheidemanns and the Kautzkys are willing to recognize the proletarian revolution provided that "after" the election the bourgeois will cooperate with bourgeois election machinery, a majority of the electorate declared itself for the revolution. It is difficult to realize the magnitude of such bourgeois obfuscation and of such bourgeois trickery in capitalists, in the bourgeois press in general and in the bourgeois State machinery.

In reality it was the bourgeoisie which was guilty of hypocrisy when it invested the hollow parliamentary equality with the high-sounding name of "democracy," while it oppressed, exploited, and deceived the workers and the poorest peasants. The imperialistic war, which the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys were so carefully bolstering up, has revealed this face to millions of people.

The proletarian is the only means of protection for the workers from the yoke of capitalism, from the military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and from imperialistic wars. It is the only step which will lead to equality and true democracy, not a democracy on paper and consisting of political phrases, but a true democracy, bringing genuine freedom with it.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkys, having failed to grasp these facts, have proved themselves of bourgeois ideas.

The Kautzkys or "Independent" party is dying and will inevitably be finally destroyed by the dissensions between the revolutionary majority of its members and the counter-revolutionary leaders.

The Communist Party will grow in strength and experience, living down the dissensions which are similar in character to those which confronted the Bolsheviks.

As far as I can judge, the dissensions among the German Communists are centered around the question of making use of bourgeois elections, the use of the Bolshevik terminology of 1900-13. To put it plainly the question is—should bourgeois parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, the councils (so-called "Gemeinde"), the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys, be made use of, or should they be boycotted? We, Russian Bolsheviks, had to go through the same kind of dissension in 1905-12, and we can plainly see that many young German Communists are simply suffering from lack of revolutionary experience. Had they lived through a couple of bourgeois revolutions (1905 and 1917, they would not be such ardent advocates of the boycott and they would not, at times, fall into the errors of Socialism.

Those are growing pains which will pass with the growth of the movement which is developing splendidly. These obvious mistakes must be fought against quite openly and honestly. One must be taken not to magnify the dissensions, for it must be clear to everyone that in the near future the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the Soviets will go away with most of these dissensions.

From the point of view of Marxist theories, as well as from that of the experience of three revolutions (1848, February 1917, and October 1917), I most decidedly consider it a great mistake to refuse participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions (Gemeinde, Gompers, etc.), and in the most reactionary workers' soviets, disfigured and mutilated by the Scheidemanns, etc. At times under certain conditions, in certain countries the boycott is the correct policy, as for instance was the boycott of the Czarist Duma by the Bolsheviks in 1904. But these same Bolsheviks took part in the first Russian bourgeois and downright counter-revolutionary Duma in 1907. The Bolsheviks participated in the elections to the bourgeois Congress Constituent Assembly in 1917, and in 1918 they departed to the profound disgust of the small-bourgeois democrats, the Kautzkys and other "Socialist" renegades. We took part in the most reactionary purely Menshevik trade-unions, which, in the matter of counter-revolutionism, are on a par with Legien's infamous and most reactionary trade-unions in Germany. Even now, two years after the conquest of State power, we are still struggling with the remnants of the Menshevik (that is to say, the Scheidemann, Kautzky, Gompers) trade-unions, which soon to prove that this is a long and tedious process, and that in certain localities and in certain unions the influence of small-bourgeois ideas is still very great.

To begin with, we were in a minority in the Soviets, the Congress Constituent Assembly, etc. It is only by prolonged hard work and struggle, before, as well as after the conquest of political power, that we obtained our majority in all the Labor organizations, and later on in the new Labor and still later in the organizations of the small peasants.

Only fools or knaves can imagine that the proletariat must, in the first place, obtain a majority in a ballot conducted by the bourgeois and their hired slaves, and that only then it can arrive at power. Such reasoning is the height of stupidity or hypocrisy; it is the substitution of the ballot box under the old regime, the old order, for the class struggle and the revolution.

The proletarian carries on its class struggle without waiting for the ballot box. It is only after, although the sympathy of the majority of the workers and consequently of the population, is required to ensure the proletarian victory at the ballot box. The proletarian carries its class struggle over, throwing the bourgeoisie, without waiting for a preliminary ballot, conducted by the bourgeois, but it knows all the time that for the successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie it is essential to have the sympathy of the majority of the workers, and consequently of the majority of the population.

The Parliamentary realm and modern Louis Blancs insist on a ballot, and a ballot conducted by the bourgeoisie in order to ascertain the amount of that sympathy for Socialism that exists amongst the workers. But those are the views of the knaves or clever tricksters.

The history of real revolutions shows that the sympathy of the majority cannot very often be proved by any kind of ballot and certainly not by a ballot organized by the exploiters, notwithstanding the existence of Parliamentary "equality" as between exploiters and the exploited.

The sympathy of the majority of the workers very frequently finds expression not through the ballot box, but by the growth of one of the parties, or by the increased number of that party's members in the Soviets, or by the success of some strike which for some reason or other had assumed great importance, or by success in the civil war, etc., etc.

The history of our revolution has, for instance, shown that the approval of the proletarian dictatorship on the part of the majority of the workers in the extensive territories of Siberia and the Urals did not manifest itself by the vote, but by a year's experience of the rule of the territorial military and civil general Koltchak. We must bear in mind that Koltchak's rule also began with a coalition of the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys (translated into Russian by the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries, the partisans of the Constituent Assembly), just as to-day in Germany Messrs. Haase and Scheidemann, with their coalition, are paying the price of their betrayal. I should like to say, in parenthesis, that the Haase-Scheidemann coalition has come to an end inside the Government, but the political coalition of traitors and betrayers remains. Proofs of this are Kautzky's books, Stamper's articles in the "Vorwärts" and articles by their followers on their "unity" and so on.

The proletarian revolution has been achieved unless the workers give their sympathy and support to its vanguard. But this sympathy and support cannot be gained all at once, nor will they be determined through the ballot box, but they will be obtained by a long, difficult and hard class struggle. The class struggle of the proletariat for the support of the majority of the workers does not end with the conquest of political power. After this conquest, the same struggle continues, but assumes a different character. In the Russian Revolution all the circumstances were exceptionally favorable to the proletariat in its struggle for dictatorship. The proletarian revolution took place at a time when the entire nation was armed, and when the entire peasantry desired the downfall of the tsarism and was inclined at the Kautzkyan policy of the traitor Socialists, the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries.

But even in Russia, where the circumstances were so favorable, where there was an immediate unity of the entire proletariat and the entire army and peasantry, even there it took the proletariat months and years to gain the support of the majority of the workers in its struggle for dictatorship. After two years this struggle is almost at an end, but even now the proletariat cannot say that the contest has been absolutely settled in its favor. It has taken us two years to gain the entire sympathy and support of the vast majority of the workers and working peasants in Great Russia, in including the Urals and Siberia, but we have not yet achieved that result with the majority of the working peasants (as distinct from the exploiting peasants) in the Ukraine. We may be crushed, and yet we shall not be completely defeated. The power of the Entente. In the interior of Russia we enjoy now such a solid support from the majority of the workers that there never has been, in the entire history of the world, a more democratic State.

Anyone who chooses to make a close study of this extremely complicated and long history of the proletarian fight for power, so rich in its manifold forms, sudden changes and transitions from one form of struggle to another—will recognize the error of those who wish to "prohibit" all participation in bourgeois Parliaments, the reactionary trade-unions, in Czarist or "Scheidemann" workers' committees, or in workshop Soviets, etc., etc. This error is the outcome of the revolutionary inexperience of the honest, sincere, convinced, heroic revolutionaries of the working class. That is why Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were a thousand times right when in January, 1919, they recognized and pointed out this mistake, but preferred to still remain with the erring proletarian revolutionaries (erring in a matter of secondary importance) than to side with the betrayers, the Socialists, the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys who did not err on the question of participation in the bourgeois Parliament, but had ceased to be Socialists and had become small-bourgeois democrats.

But a mistake is a mistake. It must be criticized, and one must endeavor to rectify it. The struggle of the workers for socialism must be relentless, but it must not be a struggle for or against participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, etc. This would constitute an enormous error, and it would mean a preference to recede from Marxist ideas and from the practical line, a strong, centralized political party, to the ideas and tactics of Syndicalism. The chief endeavor of the party should be to participate in bourgeois Parliaments, in the reactionary trade-unions, in the "workshop committees," crippled and enervated as the Scheidemanns, in fact, to participate in every organization, in order to be in continuous touch with the workers and to exercise the influence of the Communist Party on the working masses. At all costs legal work must be combined with illegal in order to bring about systematically the strict control of the legal party and its working class organization over the legal activity. This is not easy, but there are not and cannot be "easy tasks" and "comfortable" means of struggle for the proletarian.

This difficult task must somehow be fulfilled. The recognition or non-recognition of the armed rising of the workers is not the chief difference between us and the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys. The chief and fundamental difference between us and the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys is our policy in every field of activity, bourgeois Parliament, trade-unions, co-operative societies and so on.

We must fight on every field of action, without any exceptions whatsoever, against the social-traitors against reformism and opportunism. Only with these means can we achieve the proletarian, the Marxist centralized political party will lead the people without fail to the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, to the proletarian democracy, to the bourgeois democracy, to the Soviet Republic, to the Socialist world order.

The Third International has won a series of brilliant victories in the course of a few months. It grows with a remarkable rapidity. Its frequent and constant and open criticism of its errors will surely bring the working masses of all the cultural countries into the connection with the party, where they will sever all connection with the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys of all nations; these are the enemies of the proletarian revolution in all countries.

The victory of Communism is inevitable.

## Who Is Santeri Nuorteva?

June 16th, 1920.

I would advise you not to take too seriously the accusations raised by Mr. Nuorteva against Comrade Lenin. At least we, in Massachusetts, cannot do so knowing Mr. Nuorteva and his activity in the Socialist Party in Massachusetts. You might just as well believe Nuorteva's Menshevik friends in Russia, when they call Lenin a German spy and agent of the Kaiser.

This is not the first occasion where Nuorteva has co-operated with the police-powers of the capitalist state. He is one of a group of Finnish fellows, who, after expelling the revolutionary elements from the Finnish Federation of the Socialist Party in 1915, proceeded to call them "POLICE AND COURTS AS ANARCHISTS," "MENSICALISTS," etc., in order to steal their property.

In his Socialist Party activities Nuorteva has always been the worst kind of social-patriot, and will cite a few characteristic examples: Dealing with Mass. State Socialist Party Fitchburg Convention in 1915, where your trusty happened to be a delegate, and where Mr. Nuorteva with his bloc of yellow Finns and Menshevik Letts showed his skill in "political identity" (pulling the "trick" out of Liebknecht motions and resolutions), Nuorteva acted as the only spokesman of that bloc, because practically all of his delegates did not understand or could not speak in English, but only raised their hands in voting as soon as Nuorteva raised his.

Our first resolution, to congratulate Comrade Liebknecht for his stand taken against the war, "Socialism or barbarism," was defeated by Mr. Nuorteva and his bloc, on the ground that the workers SHOULD defend their "fatherland" and that "everybody's doing it now."

When we pointed out the attitude of the Russian Bolshevik party (then Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party), Nuorteva dismissed them as a set of irresponsible scoundrels. At a same convention we presented a resolution on "Dick's Military Law," pending in the U. S. Senate at that time, and proposing forced military training. Our resolution advised our young comrades to sympathize to refuse to become non-fodder. Mr. Nuorteva gave us the following advice: THIS IS NOT RUSSIA BUT AMERICA. This is a free country and we must all obey the law, once it is passed. "Law and Order" won and our resolution was defeated.

At the same time U. S. agents of the capitalist class were ready to invade Mexico for the glory of Standard Oil Company. We presented a resolution, decided for Standard Oil, and then there again showed that he is a traitor to the working class by defeating our resolution.

"Treason" and "traitors" were the only arguments of Mr. Nuorteva against the motion pointed out by Nuorteva, that he cannot avoid being a traitor. He should only decide, whether to become a traitor to the working class of U. S. and Mexico, or commit treason against Standard Oil. Nuorteva decided for Standard Oil, and then there again showed that he is a traitor to the working class by defeating our resolution.

On the same day (Sunday), a well-known minister of the Gospel in Boston preached to his congregation the subject "WHY IS HELL? CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT GO THERE," and called upon his congregation to refuse to serve in any army.

But you may argue, Nuorteva is a Bolshevik. If so, just read his "Open letter to American Liberals," and you will see that he is just a plain, everyday middle-class liberal and nothing more. As to his connections with the Soviet Bureau, he has a father flock together. You'll find there also Mr. Hilgert, the great Red Army slayer; Mr. Nuorteva, ex-inspector of ammunition under the regime of bloody Nicholas; Mr. Fredrickson, a minister of the Gospel in Finland, who always fought against Bolshevism in Russia and in this country, and are doing it now.

These real reasons, and not the "Treason" as I understand it, was to keep our party out of touch with Soviet Russia and the Third International. How long they will succeed in this remains to be seen. Meanwhile, we should continue our work of agitation and education, and not pay too much attention to the barking of "dog-hounds" of the American capitalist class, as represented by Mr. Nuorteva.

Hoping you will agree with this, I remain

Fraternally yours,

John Morgan.

## LENIN AND LONGUET

Lenin publishes an article in the "Kommunistische Internationale" with regard to a letter written to him by Longuet. In this article Lenin points out the mistake of the under the consideration movement towards the Left on the part of the working masses, certain leading Socialists would not be ready to save the party from the formal acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, being even ready to join the Third International, but, says Lenin, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a serious matter and cannot be brought about by those who accept it in fact, as well as on paper. It is impossible to accept the dictatorship of the proletariat and yet at the same time to work side by side with Thomas, Sembat, and Bracke (their English namesakes will readily be supplied by our readers). The dictatorship of the proletariat implies the continual exposing of the character of the war just ended and the daily emphasis of the possibility of war breaking out again as soon as the people show a tendency to organize the dictatorship of the proletariat. One must also show up the traitorous behavior of the Social-Democracy during the war, and every day every day every day it is essential to carry on a propaganda amongst the masses for the total abolition of capitalism instead of struggling on a purely tactical basis to better the daily conditions of the workers.

Longuet and his friends, says Lenin, do not understand this, and compares them to the Hungarian Social-Democrats, who, accepting the dictatorship of the proletariat in words, yet sought to keep Bela Kun's Government back when it later attempted to put the dictatorship into actual practice. As a result of this, thousands of Hungarian Communists have been martyred.

Longuet says: "Call it."

## THE LAST WORDS OF A COMMUNIST

The "Mittheilung" prints the last words of Eugene Levine (the German Communist executed by the "Socialist" Government of Hoffman in Munich) at his trial. It is well for all workers to remember them:

"If your verdict corresponds to the intentions of the public prosecutor, then I beg you to remember when it is being carried out. I have known a dead man who was gentle and gentle, and whether my ticket of leave shall be once again renewed, or whether I must go and join Karl Liebknecht, but my ideas will live on, and sooner or later, judges will sit in this court before whom I will be indicted those who have dared to do anything against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."



## (Continued from page 3)

The third day came the longest and most stubborn debate of the whole convention on the question of Industrial Unionism and the I. W. W. On this question the delegates were divided into three groups—one group who stood for outright endorsement of the I. W. W. (in spite of the recent convention decisions of the I. W. W.), another group who were ready to give it a limited endorsement, and a third group who believed neither in a direct endorsement of the

find this out for themselves and then they will, we can safely predict (knowing the character of these men) that C. E. C. will change the constitution, declare the "deal letter" legal and permit language federations to exist in their party.

Just as their program is "a scrap of paper" so is their constitution "a scrap of paper." Nor are their conventions "conventions." They can defy conventions and when it gets too hot spit away.

(Continued on page 5.)

## Continued from page 126

Never were the limitations of the General Strike in itself more apparent than in Berlin. The strike was complete; for eight days not a factory nor a car was in motion. But in spite of all this, the strike broke and dispersed after unsatisfactory promises of concessions by the Government...



# PARTY MATTER

## CASH STATEMENT FOR MAY, 1920.

### CASH RECEIVED:

Dues: Distr. II	125.00	
Let. Fed.	225.60	
Lith.	128.50	
Russ.	333.80	
Ukr.	233.00	1180.00
Spec. Org. Stamps: Distr. II	10.00	
" IVab	15.00	242.00
Defense Stamps: Distr. II	110.20	
" IVab	20.00	
Russ. Fed.	42.75	212.20
Defense Contrib.: Distr. II	25.00	
" IVc	150.00	
" V	28.00	203.00
Org. Fund Contrib.: Distr. II	55.00	
" III	239.45	
" IV	122.30	
" V	2.90	120.20
Leaflets: Distr. III	8.53	8.63
Mchry. Fund Contrib.: Distr. III	8.63	2.00
Distr. Act. Entries: I	97.20	
" II	4.00	
" III	98.62	
IVab	59.66	
IVc	120.00	
V	158.10	567.58
Total Received in May		3097.16
Balance from April		1230.44
		4327.60

### CASH PAID:

Office Exp: Sundry	11.77	
Supplies	24.15	
Postage	6.00	
Salaries	320.00	
Organiz. Exp: Prtg. Statem.	100.00	
Traveling	23.02	123.02
Distr. Trav. Exp: I	12.40	
III	19.98	
IVab	63.98	
V	113.95	221.89
Distr. Salaries: I	175.00	
" II	638.00	
" III	360.06	
IVab	270.00	
V	202.60	1625.00
Communist: Edit. Sal.	202.60	
Printing	358.60	
Delivery	19.00	690.10
C. E. C. Mfg. Expenditure	181.18	181.18
Office Mchry. Neostyle	65.00	
Scale	4.00	69.00
Deposit on Comm. Forms	100.00	100.00
Distr. Act. Entries: I	37.00	
" II	90.00	
" III	27.05	
IVab	100.00	
IVc	30.00	
V	167.80	601.95
Total Paid in May		3828.17
Balance to June		499.43
		4327.60

\* Inc. some back salaries and sub-distr. salaries.

### JEWISH FEDERATION

The Jewish Federation Convention held recently split at the last moment, four delegates going to the "minority" and thirteen delegates remaining with the Communist Party. Raphael and Corniel also went with the "minority" after their maneuvering to win the convention over to the "minority," and finally for "neutrality," had failed dramatically. Raphael was finally turned out to be a worthy companion to Damon, Isaac, Langley & Co. since his defection from the ranks of the "minority."

The Jewish Federation elected a C. E. C., and the process of re-organization is taking place rapidly. More than half of the membership with them and the others are slowly turning back. The Brooklyn, the largest branch in Chicago, a branch in Brooklyn, the largest branch in Chicago, a branch in Philadelphia, are with the "minority" already.

### POLISH FEDERATION

The C. E. C. of the Polish Federation has expelled Tyne, its former Secretary, who went with the "minority," and is in the process of getting back the property of the Federation in his hands. Many of the Polish branches are with the C. E. C. of the Party, and after their next convention, the whole Federation with very few exceptions will probably be back in the Party.

District No. 1. The leaflets will be printed and distributed. Our comrades suggest that the leaflets should be printed on one side only, to they can be posted on walls, poles, etc. Also text should not be very long.

I hear, that "our" joint convention has decided to demand "unity" with the "Big Bluff of Bolshevism" (E. B. J.) gang, as if they had not enough of bluff already. I don't think we should fall for it. Perhaps, they have realized that they themselves haven't enough of "bluff."

Something should be done in the Fraina case. Mr. Nuorteva is getting too bold. I think we should expose that gentleman a little, because he is not much known outside of Massachusetts.

District No. 1 delegates claimed they represented 400 members in the "unity" convention. Our Americanized Lithuanian branch is still undecided and might go with them. Their members say that the "unity" program and constitution is very very "r-revolutionary." Our own comrades say—"nix" to the Party stuff. Our District and Sub-District Committees will decide whether we should keep a paid sub-district organizer or not.

Yours for E. B. J.

District Organizer, No. 1.

District No. 2. The four sub-districts in this district are now fairly well-organized. New York City, approximately 900 members, New Jersey, 689 members, Connecticut, 287 members, and Upper New York State, about 100 members. Queens section, after having bolted the "minority," has returned to the C. E. C. Leaflets on Transport Workers and New Offensive Against Soviet Russia, printed and in the hands of sub-districts. The "minority" in this district are silent on the results of their "unity" convention, evidently they are not bragging about the results, and for good reason too, as a glance at their new organ will show.

Work is proceeding well and things are normal in general.

District No. 3. Last week I was in Wilkes Barre sub-district. Things there are alright and our work is proceeding very well. The Polish Comrades repudiated their former actions, voted that they agree with us on principles and this week they will decide whether they will participate in our convention.

Garrish came to his Jewish comrades to make a report of the "unity" convention; he started to read the program and constitution but his members didn't want to listen to a "new program." As they say they wanted only to hear "some changes," as they are not a new party. And the meeting broke up. There is complete disorganization, and they are disgusted with the actions of the "minority." It is too late to get now, but do not worry, they will come to us.

Baltimore Sub-District is O. K. Lithuanians representing 238 members, held a S. D. Convention and unanimously decided to stand with the "majority." Contributed \$50.00 with greetings to the Party.

District No. 4 (Pittsburgh and Cleveland), Erie, small but active membership—Polish, Lith., Jewish, Lettish and Russian branches—committees meet regularly—functions excellently. German branch neutral, contributes to our Party and distributes our literature. Ukrainian branch in Cleveland. Buffalo—Russian, Ukrainian, German, Polish and English branches. Committee meets regularly—finances absorbed by local defense—membership sound and solidly with the "majority" (35) and German (15) are most active and loyal.

Wheeling, W. Va. district consists of small towns along Ohio River. Membership small and inactive. Pittsburgh—Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Russian branches only—has large and active membership in 30 towns—mostly new and not broken in to party work, but loyal and active—finances good. Will become very powerful district as members are young and enthusiastic.

Akron committee against us through Centrist activities of former local secretary—consists of German, Polish, Lithuanian, Slav, Slav, Ukrainian, Russian branch entirely lost—district will have to be re-organized after convention. No finances as Secretary has told members that funds will be stolen.

Cleveland, committee recently organized and meets most regularly, membership large and inactive—finances go entirely through Federations sources. Russian branch (300 members) just pay dues. Lithuanian branch (300 members) very inactive. etts best branch and active. Youngstown, Warren, Toledo, no connections, one Ukrainian, Russian and Lithuanian branches respectively with us and will be represented in convention by delegate. This report supplements last report as to membership, does not supercede.

### RESOLUTION OF BRANCH No. 1 (PHILADELPHIA) OF THE LITHUANIAN FEDERATION

We, group of delegates of Branch 1, Lithuanian Communist Federation, at a meeting held May 1, 1920, having considered reports of both sides of the C. E. C. Communist Party, arrived at the following conclusion, and adopted a resolution to that effect:

1. Whereas, splitting the Party, especially at the present moment, while the Party is being torn to pieces by the most violent rage of reaction, and while it is in process of reorganizing itself from the open existence to an underground basis, is treason to proletarian interests and a violation of the Party discipline;

2. Whereas the "minority," headed by Damon, and acting in the role of the Party disrupters and left the Central Executive Committee;

3. And, whereas, the fundamental reason for the "minority's" withdrawal from the C. E. C. is a disagreement in the matter of principles and tactics, and not technical questions;

Therefore, Branch No. 1 of the Lithuanian Communist Federation has come to a decision, that:

1. We resolutely protest against the minority withdrawal from the C. E. C. Communist Party, and against splitting the Party;

2. We demand that the "minority" turn the Party funds over to the majority of the C. E. C.;

3. We who are clear in the majority of the Party on the question of principles, which is in harmony with the proposition of the Third Communist International and the program of the American Communist Party;

4. Together with the majority we stand for: a) The Soviet System, b) Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and a revolutionary interpretation of Mass Action.

We endorse the position taken by the Exec. Committee of the Lith. Fed. on this question, and we condemn the minority with Damon as their head, for their treacherous work of splitting the Party.

Group Delegates of Branch No. 1, Lithuanian Communist Fed., Phila., Pa.

### A New Attack Upon The Communist Party.

(Continued from page 2.)

It. By far not all "other members of Fraina's group" have been arrested, and if this is to be a sufficient basis for charges of connection with the D. of C. then most of our active members are "suspicious" individuals. Perhaps this is an implication that Nuorteva wished to be drawn from his estate.

As to Fraina's leaving in company with Nosovitzky (No. 6), the arrangements for this were made entirely independently of both, and not at all between themselves, as Nuorteva alleges.

In regard to No. 7, there has been a "trial" of Dr. Nosovitzky, the stenographic report of which shows that there were other possibilities of that letter coming into the hands of the D. of C.

As to No. 8, the Amsterdam Bureau has published in their Bulletin the whole proceedings of the Conference, and Palmer could get all his information from there without any difficulty.

All the new charges and misstatements, which would not stand investigation. To come out with them without any authoritative investigation—to the public—this is the work of a "agent-provocateur" who has BEEN PROVEN FALSE—these are but a small reflection most seriously upon the maker himself, and of course any shadows either on the persons or the Party attacked.

Yours for Communism.

D. Bunte, Act. Sec. - C. P. of A.

### "At Last" The Centrists Unite.

(Continued from page 7.)

before the next convention, organize their own convention and thus rehabilitate themselves as "leaders" (save the mark!). They have done it before and they can do it again.

### THE ELECTION FARCE

Now we come to the piece-de-resistance of the "unity convention"—the elections. We shall quote: "Late in the afternoon of the fourth day of the joint sessions (joint sessions?) and we thought all the time it was a 'unity convention'—Isn't it mean of Y. F. to so cruelly shatter our illusions and perhaps the illusions of the C. P. E. Ed.) It was decided to proceed with elections of party officials. There had been many hours of caucusing on each side as to elections. The officials of the sentiment of the convention expressed by a majority vote against further caucuses (what is a majority vote in a convention? to Damon & Co. and the C. L. P. Menchikov leaders) Ed.) neither side was willing to give the minority control of the strength. (Strange situations for people who have been shouting "unity" for over a year and are about to accomplish it "at last." Ed.)

Not how even both groups in the "unity convention" distrusted each other after the adoption of an apparently satisfactory program to all concerned. No better proof of the insincerity and hypocrisy that animated the whole convention and its proceedings can be given than the suspicion, distrust, jockeying, bargaining, trading, dickering that went on during the election of officials.

The groups stood, ready to battle for the control of the new organization. "Control" or "split" was the new slogan of both sides. But we are anticlimax to give the minority control of the group was there and witnessed it: "Then came ten nominations for the nine places on the C. E. C. Damon, Scott, Reinhart, Dellon, Zemlin (C. P.); Meyer, Klein, Flynn Brown, Dawson (C. P.). These were the caucus nominations. Obviously the C. L. P. caucus had determined to avail itself of the dissensions in the C. P. ranks and to attempt to elect a majority of the committee. (Won't somebody be shouting "packed" convention soon? Ed.)

"At the night session was announced the result of the balloting: Damon, Scott, Klein, Flynn, 29; Brown, 22; Dawson, 22; Meyer 30; Reinhart, 23; Dellon, Zemlin tied at 24. (Damon & Co. evidently got a bad licking and they knew it too. Watch them swing into action when the question of control is involved. There he fights it out. But on principles, that's another story. Ed.)

"Damon, Scott and Reinhart quickly offered resignations. A bitter discussion was precipitated. Both sides had played for "control" and the C. P. had been a boomerang; for how it was urged, could the C. P. delegates report back to their members that they had been outwitted in strategy in order to give the minority control of the united party? Even though the fault was that of the C. P. delegates themselves, how could that remedy the outside situation? (Here Y. F. unwillingly gives a sidelight on the situation which would make pleasant reading about a Democratic or Republican Convention but coming from a so-called Communist Convention represents the very lowest order of political conduct. Do you see what worried the "minority" C. P. delegates—not the formulation of a Communist Program and Constitution—the laying of the basis for their activities for the coming year—or even the superficial achievement of "unity" which they did manage to accomplish for the time—but what their members will think if the C. L. P. gets control of the party? Ed.)

After some bitter retorts from the C. L. P. a recess was held for half an hour.

"Then began the tug of war which went into the middle of the night, only to be resumed the next morning—this time the groups, apparently completely welded, now standing squarely against the C. P. and C. L. P. The convention vanished; in its place were two caucuses, with committees for interchange of offers and counter-proposals.

"The strained item in the C. P. camp had been an attack upon Caxton, based on the "majority" C. P. criticism. (So, our work was bearing fruit "at last." Ed.) In the C. P. caucus, after long discussion, it had been nominated for the C. E. C. 18 to 9. (Was Reinhart, who used to denounce Y. F. when he appeared at meetings one of the 9?)

Later Caxton withdrew his name. Now it was insisted that his name be re-introduced, making Zemlin first alternate. Caxton was to be substituted Caxton for Brown as International Secretary. (The International Secretaryship, the highest office in the party, is something of a traded and bargained for not on the basis of the man most fit for it but on a purely bourgeois basis of political trading. Ed.)

"The last morning found the situation deadlocked. To open the convention again meant to give the C. P. the advantage of the renewed caucus. Pressure in favor of solidarity for C. P. control, all questions of personality aside, the issue of control having been precipitated by the turn of the election, the C. P. delegates were in no mood to give up their demand for a majority of the C. E. C.

"The C. P. delegates made only demand, to reopen the convention, it was for the other side to make the next move.

"How is one to visualize one group of delegates in heated argument, while the other group is engaged in the singing of revolutionary songs, mostly by Russian—how is one to imagine all this without the group of special dimensions? The singing group marches halfway toward the argument, and reluctantly back to its own meeting place.

"There is a committee conference. Before the report comes back the lines are formed for a new march. This time to go all the way. Agreement is reached. C. L. P. to stand elected, five C. P. members the only report to the anxious C. L. P. delegates—the two groups merge into one another, all singing the International. There is the grasping of hands, the embrace of comrades, nothing is said—there is too much feeling for speech.

"At last!" as Damon would say, the torture and suspense is over "unity is achieved." The Centrists have united into the United Centrist Party of America!

Need anything more be added to the foregoing? Surely, every reader has formed a vivid picture in his mind of the "unity convention" which gave birth to it. C. P. E. C. and Co. were a farce, a farce, fathered by Centrists of the type of Damon, who claims to be a Communist, and mothered by the C. L. P.—with one exception—how is it possible for the I. I. International in the role of godfather (the latter organization responsible for a great deal of the discrediting of the C. P. and doing on a regular basis in the Communist Party, through his unwarranted meddling). This new United Centrist Party is doomed to an ignoble career in the Communist movement in this country.